

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

Claims 2-20 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been canceled. The Applicant has amended claims 2, 3, 6, 11-13, 15, 19, and 20. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Amendments to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the Abstract for a misspelling. The Applicants have amended the Abstract to correct the misspelling “ftoin” to --from--.

The Examiner objected to the specification because of the spelling errors “signalling” and “dialling”. The Applicants note that the specification is drafted using standard spelling in use in the UK and Europe. This spelling differs from standard spelling used in the US in words such as “signaling” and “dialing”. The Applicants respectfully request approval of the specification with standard UK spelling.

3.) Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 2 because the term “protocol” has no antecedent basis in claim 1. The Applicant's review of claim 2 has found no use of the term protocol. However, the term protocol is used in claim 3, and the Applicants have amended claim 3 to correct the antecedent basis problem. The withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to claim 6 because the step of “signaling an access number to said first node” has no basis. The Applicants have amended claim 6 to clarify that the referenced step is the step of sending the circuit switched access number from the control node to the first node. The withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

4.) Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 2-10 and 14 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but stated they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants have amended claim 2 in this matter. Claims 3-18 have been amended, where necessary, to depend from rewritten claim 2. Therefore the allowance of claims 2-18 is respectfully requested.

5.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)

Claims 1, 11-13, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pelaez, *et al.* (US 2004/0190689). The Applicants have amended claims 11-13, 15, and 16 to depend from allowable claim 2. Therefore, the allowance of claims 11-13, 15, and 16 is respectfully requested.

6.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelaez in view of Surdila et al. (US 2002/0110104) and further in view of Kallio et al. (US 2004/0190498). The Applicants have amended claims 19 and 20 to recite limitations similar to those in allowable claim 2. Basis for the amendments is found in Figures 5 and 6. Therefore the allowance of amended claims 19 and 20 is respectfully requested.

7.) Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 2-20.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven W. Smith
Registration No. 36,684

Date: December 10, 2007

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-1572
steve.xl.smith@ericsson.com